Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant
License Renewal - Public Meeting
Afternoon Session

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Ontario, New York

Date: Thursday, August 7, 2003

Work Order No.: NRC-1026 Pages 1-74

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING ON THE

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FOR THE

R.E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

LICENSE RENEWAL

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, AUGUST 7, 2003

1:30 P.M.

FIREMAN'S EXEMPT HALL

1840 ROUTE 104

ONTARIO, NEW YORK 14519

The meeting on the above-entitled matter commenced at 1:30 p.m., Francis "Chip" Cameron, presiding as Moderator/Facilitator.

NRC Presenters:

JOHN TAPPERT

RUSSELL ARRIGHI

ROBERT SCHAAF

DUANE NEITZEL

MARK RUBIN

RICHARD EMCH

I-N-D-E-X

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1:33 p.m.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the NRC's public meeting. My name is Chip Cameron, and I'm the special counsel for public liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for today's meeting. And in that role I'll try to assist all of you in having a productive meeting today.

Today's meeting is on the draft environmental impact statement that the NRC has prepared to assist the NRC in making a decision on an application to renew the license at the Ginna nuclear power plant. And this application was submitted by Rochester Gas and Electric.

And I just wanted to take just a couple of minutes to go over some of the meeting process issues before we get into the substance of today's discussion.

In terms of objectives for the meeting, we want to make sure that we clearly explain to everyone what the license renewal process is all about, what the role of environmental review is in that license renewal process. And most importantly, in terms of information to give you a summary of what the NRC has

found in the draft environmental impact statement.

The second objective is to hear from you, anybody who wants to give us any advice or recommendations on the license renewal process and specifically the draft environmental impact statement. And I do want to emphasize the information aspect of the meeting, because we're also requesting written comments on the draft environmental impact statement, but we wanted to be here with you today to talk to you in person and anything that you say today, anything you give us in comments will be, will have the same weight as a written comment.

We're transcribing the meeting. Mary Ann is our stenographer and that will be a written record of the meeting that will be available not only to the NRC for purposes of evaluating comments, but also to the public. And you may hear things this afternoon, either from the NRC or from members of the audience that will give you information that will either perhaps stimulate you to submit a written comment or to help you to prepare your written comments. So if there's anything that you don't understand that we don't clearly explain to you, please ask so that we can try to get you that information.

The format of the meeting matches the

objectives in terms of providing information. We're going to have some NRC presentations for you on various issues, and I'll go through those in a minute. And then after each presentation or each two presentations, we're going to go out to you to see if you have any questions that we can answer for you.

Second part of the meeting is for us to listen to any formal comments that you may have and if you want to make a comment, there is a yellow card in the back that we'd like you to fill out. And that's not a requirement. If you want to come up and speak, that's fine. But it just gives us an idea of how many people to expect during the formal comment period.

And that leads me to the ground rules for today's meeting, which are very simple. If you want to say anything, ask a question, please, just signal me and I'll bring you what the NRC's staff has told is a wireless microphone. And we'll get you on the record. If you can just give us your name and affiliation, if appropriate, and ask your question and we'll try to get an answer for you. And when we get to the -- particularly when we get to the formal comment part of the meeting, I just ask everyone to try to be as concise as possible so that we can make sure that we hear from everybody who wants to speak.

I don't think that we have a whole lot of people this afternoon who want to talk, so that gives us a little bit more flexibility time-wise. But usually I use a guideline of five to seven minutes, but as I've said that's not any sort of a drop dead guideline because we do have time this afternoon. I want to just tell you what the agenda is so you know what to expect, and give you a little bit of an idea, biography on some of our speaks so that you know what their expertise is.

We're going to start in just a moment when I'm done with John Tappert, who is right here.

And John Tappert is the Chief of the Environmental Review Section within our Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. And John and his staff are responsible for overseeing the environmental reviews that are done, not just on these types of license renewal applications, but for any issue that deals with reactors, where the NRC needs to look at environmental impacts before they make a decision on a particular issue.

In terms of background, John has been with the NRC for approximately 12 years. He was a resident inspector and these people are particularly important to the NRC because they are the ones who are at the

reactors. They live in the community and they make sure that NRC requirements are being followed. Before that, he was in the nuclear Navy. He has a bachelor's degree in Aerospace and Oceanographic Engineering from Virginia Tech and a master's degree in Environmental Engineering from Johns Hopkins University.

John is going to give us a short welcome and then we're going to go to two members of the NRC staff who are going to give you an overview of the license renewal process.

The first person that we're going to hear from is Mr. Russ Arrighi, who is right here. He's the project manager for the safety review on the Ginna License Renewal Application.

And then we're going to go to Bob Schaaf who is the project manager on the environmental review, which is the specific focus of today's meeting. Then we'll go on to you for any questions that you might have about process.

In terms of Russ' background, he's been with the NRC for about 14 years. He was also a resident inspector. Like John, Russ was at the Millstone Power Plant in Connecticut and also the Pilgrim Power Plant in Massachusetts. Before the NRC, he was at the Norfolk Naval Ship Yard as a test

engineer, and he has a bachelor's in chemical engineering from the University of Rhode Island, and we'll have Russ up there in a minute.

Bob Schaaf is right here and Bob has been with the NRC for about 13 years also. He has served as project manager in our office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation in operating reactors in the environmental section. He also worked at the Naval Ship Yard, the Charleston Naval Ship Yard in engineering and he has a bachelor's in mechanical engineering from Georgia Tech.

So after we get done with process, we're going to focus on the heart of the discussion today and that is the findings in the draft environmental impact statement. And to present that, we have Duane Neitzel who is right here. And Duane is the team leader for the group of expert scientists that the NRC has doing the environmental review for the Ginna Plant. Duane is a fish biologist. He's been with Pacific Northwest Lab for about 32 years. He has a bachelor's in zoology from the University of Washington and a Master's in Biosciences from Washington State? Washington State University.

After Duane is done, we'll go back out to you again for questions and then we're going to go to

a special subject in the draft environmental impact statement, and that's something called severe accident mitigation alternatives. And they're called SAMAs. We have Mark Rubin from the NRC staff with us who is going to do that presentation. And Mark is a Section Chief in the probabilistic safety assessment branch, again, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation at the NRC. And he's been at the NRC for 27 years, primarily working in something that's called probabilistic risk assessment, and I think when you hear from Mark today you'll get a better understanding of what that particular expertise is. He has a Master's and Bachelor's of Science in Nuclear Engineering from the University of California in Los Angeles, UCLA. He's a member of the American Nuclear Society, the Probabilistic Risk Assessment Standards Committee.

With that, I would just like to thank you all for being here. We have a lot of experts from the NRC and our expert consultants. We have people from our Office of General Counsel. I would just urge you to after the meeting, if you have questions, get to know them, talk to them. And keep in touch, if you have questions or concerns. We'll give you some phone numbers and addresses today and we do have something called an evaluation form. I think formally it is

called a feedback form where we try to find out how we're doing in public meetings. So it is at the back table and if you could just fill it out and leave it with us if you're so inclined. It already has a metered stamp so to speak on it. You can just drop them in a mailbox.

And with that, I'm going to ask John to come up and welcome.

MR. TAPPERT: Thank you, Chip. Good afternoon and welcome. As Chip said, my name is John Tappert and I'm the Chief of the Environmental Section in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. And on behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, I would like to thank you for taking time out of your afternoon today and participating in our process.

I would like to briefly go over the agenda and purposes of today's meeting.

First of all, we're going to provide a brief overview of the entire license renewal process. Now this includes both a safety review, as a well as the environmental review, which will be the principal focus of today's meeting. Then we're to provide you the results of our environmental impact statement that was developed to assess the impacts associated with extending the operating license of the Ginna nuclear

power plant for an additional 20 years.

Then we'll provide you some information about the balance of our review schedule and how you can submit comments after today's meeting, and then the most important part of today's meeting, which is to receive any comments that you may have today on our draft and environmental impact statement, or EIS.

But first I'd like to provide some general context on the license renewal program and why we're here today.

Next slide.

(Slide change.)

MR. TAPPERT: The Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the authority to issue operating licenses to commercial nuclear power plants for a period of 40 years. For the Ginna nuclear power plant, that operating license will expire in 2009. Our regulations also made provision is for extending that operating license for an additional 20 years as a part of a license renewal program and RG&E has requested renewal for Ginna.

As part of the NRC's review of that application, we developed an environmental impact statement. As part of that environmental impact statement process, we held a public meeting here last

fall to seek early public input in our review. As we indicated at that earlier scoping meeting, we returned here now today to present the findings in our draft environmental impact statement. And again, the principal purpose of today's meeting is to receive your comments on that draft.

With that brief introduction, I'd like to ask Russ to provide some more insights on this safety review.

MR. ARRIGHI: Thank you, John. As John mentioned my name is Russ Arrighi. I'm the project manager for the safety review of Ginna's license renewal application. Before discussing the license renewal process and the safety review, I'd like to talk a little bit about the NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its role in licensing and regulating nuclear power plants. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorized the NRC to regulate civilian use of nuclear material. The NRC mission is threefold, to ensure the adequate protection of public health and safety, to protect the environment, and to provide for common defense and security.

NRC consists of five commissioners, one of whom is a chairman. They're also with the NRC staff. The regulations enforced by the NRC are issued under

Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, which we call 10 CFR. Excuse me.

As John mentioned, the Atomic Energy Act provided for a 40-year license term for power reactors. But it also allowed for license renewal. The 40-year term is based primarily on economic and anti-trust considerations rather than safety limitations.

As a result, some of the components weren't designed to operate, designed to last greater than 40 years. And operating experience demonstrated that some major components such a steam generators didn't last that long. For that reason, a number of utilities had to replace major components, and since components and structures can be replaced or reconditioned, a plant's life is really determined by economic factors.

Again, the operating license for Ginna expires in September 2009. Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation has applied for and requests authorization to operate Ginna up to an additional 20 years.

Now I'd like to talk about license renewal, which is governed by the requirements of 10 CFR part 54 or the license renewal rule. This part of the code of federal regulations defines the regulatory

process by which a nuclear utility applies for license renewal. The license renewal rule also incorporates 10 CFR part 51 by reference. This part of the code provides for preparation of an environmental impact statement. The license renewal process involves a safety review and environmental impact evaluations, plants inspections, and are reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, or ACRS.

The ACRS is a group of scientists and nuclear experts who serve as a consulting body to the Commission. The ACRS performs an independent review of the application in the staff's safety evaluation. And they report their findings and recommendations directly to the Commission.

Next slide, please.

(Slide change.)

MR. ARRIGHI: The next slide illustrates a two parallel process for license renewal. The top part talks about the safety review, which I'm the project manager for and the bottom section talks about the environmental review which Bob Schaaf will discuss later.

The safety review involves the staff's review of the technical information in the application. To verify with reasonable assurance that

the plant can continue to operate safely during the extended period of operation. The staff assesses how the applicant proposes to monitor or manage the aging applicable to passive long-lived structures and components that are within the scope of license renewal and documents its assessment of the effectiveness of the Applicant's programs in the SER.

So we do the review, the safety review, and we put out an evaluation in a safety evaluation report.

Now the current regulation is adequate for addressing active components, such as pumps and valves, which are continually challenged to reveal failures and degradation such that corrective actions can be taken to resolve them. The current regulations are also adequate to also address other aspects of the original license such as security and emergency planing. These current regulations also apply during the extended period of operation.

The ACES then would get the safety evaluation report where they do an independent review and again, they review the application and they provide their report directly to the Commission. The safety review also includes inspections, on-site inspections by the regional -- I'm sorry. The safety

review process also involves two or three inspections which are documented in NRC inspection reports, and they're performed by regional inspectors. Again, at the bottom of the slide of the environmental review process, the environmental review which involves scoping activities, preparation of a draft supplement to the generic environmental impact statements, solicitation of public comments on the draft supplement, and then the issuance of a final supplement to the generic environmental impact statements, and Bob Schaaf will discuss that further.

The decision to renew an operating license, the NRC considers the safety evaluation report, the ACRS report, the inspection reports, and also the NRC Regional Administrator's recommendation. Again, the Regional Administrator is aware of the day to day operation of the plant and he has an input and a say on whether or not the license should be renewed.

The license renewal process also allows for hearings. In September of 2002, the NRC issued a Federal Register notice to announce its acceptance of RG&E's application for renewal. Its notice also announced the opportunity for public participation in the process. There were no petitions to intervene, no petitions were received by the staff.

This concludes my summary, and now I'd like to turn the mic over to Bob Schaaf.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much Russ. And we're going to Bob and then we're going to go out to you for questions. We're getting some static on the transcript with this mic so why don't you try this one and we'll see if that's better. Bob Schaaf, the environmental review..

MR. SCHAAF: Thank you, Jim. Thank you, Russ. I'd like to welcome everyone this afternoon. Your participation is appreciated. It is an important component of our environmental review process.

Once again, my name is Bob Schaaf. I'm the environmental project manager for the Ginna license renewal application. I'm responsible for coordinating the efforts of the NRC staff and the contractors from the national labs to conduct and document the review of RG&E's application for license renewal at Ginna.

NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act was enacted in 1969. The act requires all federal agencies to use the systematic approach to consider environmental impacts during certain decision making proceedings regarding major federal actions. NEPA requires that we examine the environmental impacts of

proposed actions and consider mitigation measures, which are actions that can be taken to decrease any environmental impacts identified.

NEPA also requires that we consider alternatives to the proposed action and that we evaluate the impacts of those alternatives. Finally, NEPA requires that we disclose all of this information and that we invite public participation to evaluate it.

The NRC has determined that it will prepare an environmental impact statement for requests to renew plants' operating licenses. Therefore, following the process required by NEPA, we have prepared a draft environmental impact statement that describes the impacts associated with operation of Ginna for an additional 20 years.

The draft environmental impact statement was issued at the end of June. The meetings today are being held to provide an overview of our preliminary conclusions and to receive your comments on the draft. This slide describes the objective of our environmental review as defined in our regulations. Simply put, we're trying to determine whether the renewal of the Ginna license is acceptable from an environmental standpoint, whether or not that option

is exercised, that is, whether or not the plant actually operates for the additional 20 years, will be determined by others, such as RG&E and state regulatory agencies. It will also depend on the outcome of the safety review described previously by Russ.

(Slide change.)

MR. ARRIGHI: This slide shows with a little more detail the process for environmental review of the Ginna license renewal application. We received the application at the end of July of last year. We issued a notice of intent, which was published in the Federal Register in October of last year. This notice informed the public that we were going to prepare an environmental impact statement, also referred to as an EIS, and invited the public to provide comments on the scope of our environmental review.

In November of last year, during that scoping period, we held two public meetings in this area to receive public comments on the scope of issues that should be included in the EIS for the Ginna license renewal. Also in November, while we were here for the public meetings, we went to the Ginna site with the team of NRC staff and personnel from several

of the national laboratories with backgrounds in the specific technical and scientific disciplines required to perform our environmental review.

We familiarized ourselves with the site, met with RG&E staff to discuss the information submitted in their license renewal application. We reviewed environmental documentation maintained at site and we examined RG&E's environmental evaluation process. In addition, we contacted federal, state, and local officials, local service agencies, and Native American tribes with potential historical ties to the plant area to gather information for our review.

At the close of the scoping comment period, we gathered up and considered all of the comments that we received. Many of these comments contributed to the document we are here to discuss today. In December of last year, we issued requests for additional information to ensure that any information that we relied on in preparing our draft impact statement and that had not been included in the original application was submitted for the public record. At the end of June of this year, we issued the draft environmental impact statement for public comment.

This was issued to supplement 14 to the generic environmental impact statement regarding license renewal, because we rely on the findings in the generic impact statement for part of our conclusions. Duane Neitzel will provide additional detail about the relationship between the generic impact statement and the Ginna supplement as part of his presentation.

The fact that we refer to the supplement as a draft does not mean that it is incomplete. It is considered a draft because we are at an intermediate stage in our decision making process. We're in the middle of a second public comment period to allow you and other members of the public, as well as state and federal agencies, to review our preliminary findings and conclusions and provide any comments you may have on the report. After we gather these comments and evaluate them, we may find that we need to change portions of the environmental impact statement based on those comments.

The NRC will make any necessary changes and then issue a final environmental impact statement related to license renewal for Ginna. Currently, our goal is to issue that document in February of next year.

This concludes my overview of the environmental review process. We can now entertain any questions regarding the processes described by Russ and myself.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Okay, great. Thank you. Thank you, Bob. Thank you, Russ. Do we have some questions on process before we get into the substance of the draft environmental impact statement? If there's anything that isn't clear, please ask and we can always go back for questions after the formal comment period too if something comes up. Okay, great.

Well, let's hear about the findings in the draft environmental impact statement.

Duane, are you ready?

MR. NEITZEL: Yes.

MODERATOR CAMERON: All right. And this is Duane Neitzel.

MR. NEITZEL: Thank you. My name is Duane Neitzel. I am the laboratory lead for the development of the supplemental environmental impact statement for the license renewal at Ginna. I'm responsible for coordinating the efforts of the staff in the national labs in the conducting of this review. I'm going to discuss the information gathering process

that we used, the composition of the review team, and the process we used for review, the information in the applicant's environmental review report, and then discuss some of the results and discuss the results of the supplemental EIS.

If you look at in the middle of this graphic here, we refer to the SEIS. That's a supplement to another impact statement that has been developed, which is the generic environmental impact statement for license renewal. That impact statement has been prepared, reviewed, and accepted by and published by the NRC.

As we go to each one of the power plants that request a renewal of their license, then we supplement that GEIS and for brevity we call it the SEIS. And so I'll be referring to the SEIS, which is the supplement to the GEIS throughout my talk.

You see the arrows pointing to the SEIS? That's where we get the information. The license renewal application, this was prepared by Rochester Gas and Electric. Part of that license renewal request included an environmental report. They looked at all these issues that we looked at. They provided information about their operations, about the environment, and about those effects. That was a big

part of the information that we had to review. We also, the staff audit was mentioned. The NRC staff and the National Laboratory staff went to the site, looked at the facility, looked at the operations, looked at records. We did that last November.

We took that information. That went into the SEIS. Your comments from the scoping meeting and from other comments that were sent in were considered. We also met with state and local agencies, some federal agencies related to the management of these resources in this area. Got their comments, asked them what their concerns were on each of those issues. Then we put that information together.

Next slide, please

(Slide change.)

MR. NEITZEL: This is to give you some idea of the team that was brought together to evaluate each one of these issues. We had scientists and engineers that are experts in atmospheric sciences, land use, aquatic and terrestrial ecology, radiation protection, hydrology and water quality, socio-economics, historic and archeological resources. All these individuals reviewed this material. Some of them are here tonight or this afternoon and they are here to answer your questions, discuss the review with

you, and talk to you, if you have any questions. They'll be around. They have a tag on like this and with their name and identifying them as members of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Next slide.

(Slide change.)

MR. NEITZEL: Some more on the process that we used and back to these words, GEIS and SEIS. The generic environmental impact statement looks at a whole range of activities, issues, and come up with 92 different aspects of operation in the environment that needs to be assessed, looked at those and ended up with two categories. Category one issues and category two issues.

Category one issues are impact statements where we've looked at the potential impact at all the plants operating in the United States and come to the conclusion that no matter where you are that you get the same impact statement.

There are a little over 20 of those that are category two issues. There it was determined that you could not say that the impact statement is going to be the same at every site. And those were then determined that you had to do a site-specific analysis to address those. So we had these category one,

category two issues. These issues were not ignored when we looked at the site-specific information at Ginna. They're all there. It's just that this category one, category two helps us focus on those issues specific to Ginna.

One of the other things that I'm going to be talking about a little bit more is we did look for new information that might say that this impact statement needs to be further evaluated and go into a site specific evaluation. So this process leads to this site-specific performance.

We also looked for new issues -- is there something out there in the 90 some issues that have been listed and identified and available for you to look at? Is there something new here, something we haven't seen before and does that need to be evaluated, yes or no. But all that information then goes into our analysis.

Next slide.

(Slide change.)

MR. NEITZEL: When we looked at these issues, looked at the operations, looked at the possibility of 20 more years of operation, then we have to say what is the level of impact. And we used three impact levels in our conclusions, small,

moderate, and large. These definitions are consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality and NEPA guidance. The NRC regulations have specific metrics and definitions of how for each of these activities how they can be rated as small, moderate, or large.

Quickly, the small impacts are you can't see any change from this activity and there is no long term or deleterious to that resource. Moderate is you might be able to see a change, but it is not going to have an impact on that, deleterious long term effect on that resource. And the large impacts are you can see the impact, you can measure it, and it does actually change the, has the potential to change that resource. The example that I always like to deal with is fisheries because that's my background. If one of these activities at the site you could actually measure changes in the population or changes in the habitat from withdrawing water or discharging heated water, but it wasn't changing the population. There was a lot of habitat. The habitat of the area wasn't totally effected. You could see that change, but that would be a moderate impact.

If you couldn't see them, couldn't measure that change, and there was no long term impacts that would be small. Large is where you could actually see

numbers of fish being taken out of the environment or significant parts of the habitat being changed. So there wasn't available to these fish and that was going to have a long term impact on the population, then that would be a large impact.

But for each of these categories, for socio-economic, environmental justice, radiation worker protection, each of these we went through and looked at is that impact small, moderate, or large. So the next slide

(Slide change.)

MR. NEITZEL: I'm going to talk about some of these categories, I wish I had a slide here and for the next time I do this, but it's in the draft that we brought along. I wish I had listed all 92 of those issues because I'm not dismissing them, I'm trying to keep this focused on a few of the items and how we do this. This list of all 92 issues and which ones are category one and which ones are category two are available here, summarized, we can talk about that. So I'm not ignoring other things. I'm just focusing for this discussion on what we're going to talk about.

One other point I want to make real quickly is when I talk about conclusions, those are really preliminary conclusions. This is a draft.

These conclusions are going to be reviewed further. So the conclusions of the staff will come out in the final SEIS, not here. So if I say conclusion, here preliminary conclusion.

I guess next I'm going to focus on the cooling system and how we evaluated that and looked at that. So would you go to that?

(Slide change.)

MR. NEITZEL: Here's a picture, a north facing picture of the plant, the lake out here. Water is withdrawn from the lake and discharged into the lake, and we looked at the issues related to entrainment, impingement, and heat shock for the use of that water for operating the plant. And our preliminary findings are that the impacts from the cooling water related to each of these issues is small and that no additional mitigation is required.

As Bob mentioned, one of the things we look at is are these resources being impacted and are potential impacts for these resources, is the operation occurring in such a way that those impacts are mitigated or lessened?

When water is withdrawn into the system here, there is a series of screens to keep debris and stuff out. Fish can potentially get entrained in that

water, impinged on that screen. Are those screens operated in such a way, are the gaps in the screen such that they minimize or eliminate the fish that are killed or entrained or impinged?. Those are mitigation activities and we reviewed those things.

The placement of the intake structure, is that such to minimize the entrainment of fish? Is the placement of the heated water discharge such to minimize impacts to fishery habitat? And we've concluded that there is no additional mitigation required related to the issues withdrawing cooling water. And so we did this kind of thing for each one of those issues, went through and made these kinds of determinations and looked at mitigation.

The next example that I want to talk about is the radiological impacts. This is a category one issue. You get to the same conclusion for all plants and so the site's specificity is related back to the generic environmental impact statement. But because it is often a concern of the public, I'm going to take just a minute and discuss how we determine that there's no new information that is related to the radiological impacts for the plants. And we looked at the radiological effluent release monitoring program during our site visit. We looked at how the gasses

and liquid effluents were treated and released.

Then we also looked at the solid waste, which is not released. It is treated, packaged, and shipped elsewhere for disposal. This information is in the SEIS, in the draft SEIS, and we looked at how the applicant, RG&E, how they determined and demonstrated their compliance with these regulations. We looked at five years of records, reviewed them with the applicant and then they gave us access to those records and we reviewed them in the draft SEIS, and we looked at the how the applicant, RG&E, how they determined and demonstrated their compliance with these regulations. We looked at five years of records, reviewed them with the applicant and then they gave us access to those records and we reviewed them.

Our expert from Lawrence Livermore looked at those records independently and reviewed them and looked at these things, came up with the no new significant information, no change from the conclusion that's in the GEIS. Thank you.

Another area that was in that flow chart that's really important that I want to talk about is new information and whether new information that we find is significant. This is something, this is not

only something that we look for, but NRC staff looks for this, the applicant and their staff is constantly looking for new information, and that's one of the reasons and one of the things the we discussed at the scoping meeting is do you have new information that we should look at?

This is something we looked at with the state agencies and the federal agencies and said do you have new information? And one of the things that came up was the, that was brought up by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation was the issues related to the revetment. If you remember that picture in the, of the shoreline, that shoreline is protected with riprap and stuff. Somebody at one of the meetings says well, is there a differential erosion of that shoreline beyond that revetment? Is there or could the revetment cause a change in the rate of erosion related to the areas that aren't protected and stuff?

Well, that sounded like new information. It sounded like something new and it could potentially effect the land use or aquatic environments, terrestrial environments. So we looked at that, the licensee looked at that, did a survey. We discussed this with the state agencies that brought this up and

we reviewed the information about the shoreline erosion and the design of the revetment at Ginna. And the staff preliminary concludes that the comments made by the New York State Department and Environmental Conservation do not represent information that would call into question the Commission's conclusion regarding GEIS category one issues and that the impacts on the aquatic and terrestrial resources and land use from the continued operation of GEIS are small and that additional plant specific mitigation measures are not warranted at this time.

So that's part of the process and one of the issues that we evaluated because of the comment meetings.

Next area of comments are the cumulative effects. One of the things that is required by NEPA, required by NRC and their guidance for doing impact statements is considering impacts of renewal in terms of past actions, present actions, and foreseeable, reasonably foreseeable future actions. This was also brought up at the scoping meeting. Somebody asked what are you going to do about cumulative impacts?

Well, we did and we documented that assessment in the draft SEIS and would like you to look at that. We had two concerns there. How do you

temporarily confine or bracket what you're going to look at -- not confine, but bracket? And we said we're going to start with when that site was changed, when the construction started, when the plant construction began. And then go 20 years beyond the license. That would be the foreseeable, the current is what's going on now and the foreseeable future.

Then we had to spatially define what we're looking at. It turns out that there wasn't one answer for that because for each one of these resources, it was different. For the aquatic resources we had the lake there. That's where the aquatic resources of the plant are associated with Lake Ontario. And we looked at that. For the terrestrial environment, we were very concerned about the transmission corridors and areas around that for threatened endangered species.

We looked at counties around the plant and whether or not any plants or animals occurred there or could possibly occur there in the foreseeable future. For the socio-economic stuff, we looked at the counties where the people live, that work there, the traffic patterns, you know where they drive their cars to and from work, where the taxes are paid to which counties, and stuff and looked at those cumulative effects.

After we looked at all these things, we found no significant cumulative impacts and no need for any further mitigation related to that.

Next slide please.

(Slide change.)

MR. NEITZEL: Two other things we looked at were the uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management and decommissioning. Environmental issues associated with the fuel cycle and solid waste management were discussed in the generic environmental impact statement for license renewal. The staff did not identify any new information on this issue during its independent review of Ginna, the visit or the scoping process or for comments and for all of these issues related to the fuel cycle and waste management, the staff concluded that the impacts are small and that no new mitigation is required.

Decommissioning, again, the NRC has an impact statement related to decommissioning. We looked at that and how that relates specifically to Ginna. These are the impacts that may occur after the plant is shut down. And again, we saw no differences from that generic impact statement. There was no new information and nothing to change the impact statements that are in the GEIS.

Next slide.

(Slide change.)

MR. NEITZEL: Second to the last slide in case you're wondering. One of the things that is required again by CQ, NEPA, and NRC is when you look at a proposed action, you have to look at alternatives. The most important one here is the no action. No action is defined by not renewing the license. That's what we looked at and then alternative energy sources. These are alternatives to the license renewal. We looked at new generation, purchases, oil, wind, solar generation, conservation, and then importantly combinations of those alternatives.

Again, for each one of these we review each of these issues in aquatic, terrestrial, socio-economic, went through that list each time and compared the proposed action and the alternatives to the no action to look at that.

Last slide

(Slide change.)

MR. NEITZEL: And the preliminary conclusions for the alternatives, the alternatives including the no action alternatives may have environmental effects in at least some impact

categories that reach moderate or large significance. And this is all compared across, and those comparisons in a table of each one of those is in the GEIS. So at this time, Chip, I've concluded.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Thank you, that was a great summary. Let's see if anybody has some questions for you on the preliminary conclusions, as you pointed out.

Any questions on the analysis that was on the draft environmental statement?

MR. NEITZEL: There's one there in the back, Chip.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Ah, good.

MR. NEITZEL: And one over here too.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Okay, let's go back here and then go over there. If you could just give us your name, sir?

DR. LOOMIS: Hi, I'm Dr. Norm Loomis, Town Health Officer, also live on the lake, used to live directly across from the plant. Similar studies were done prior to building the plant in 1969, when it opened in 1969 or 1970. Were there any changes from their conclusions to those at this time in your studies?

MODERATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Dr. Loomis.

MR. NEITZEL: Yes, do you want to address that, Bob?

MR. SCHAAF: I think the answer there would be that yeah, there is a different in the conclusions. The original study looked at the impact of actually building a facility taking a greenfield, so you're going to have some impacts associated with that and then this study looks at the incremental impact of the additional term of operation. You've got this plant in place. It's operating. It's having whatever impacts the original study suggested it would have and what we're focusing on here is the incremental effect of allowing the plant to continue to operate versus ceasing operation at the end of its license term.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Does that get to your point, Dr. Loomis or would you like to clarify at all?

DR. LOOMIS: It gets to the end of it, but were there any surprises? Were there any changes in the environmental stuff relating to the lake and the surrounding area from that earlier study?

MODERATOR CAMERON: This is Mr. Mike Masnik from the NRC Staff.

MR. MASNIK: Mike Masnik. Much of the effort back then was predictive and it was based on

the environmental conditions at the time. As we all know, for example, the lake has changed, species, composition of fish and such, but overall the conclusions on impact to the environment that were predicted seemed to be borne out by the studies conducted since then and what we found in our evaluation last fall.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Okay, great. Thank you. Let's go over here to Mr. Tim Judson. And Tim, please introduce yourself to us.

MR. JUDSON: Yes, my name is Tim Judson. I'm with the Citizens Awareness Network in Central New York. I guess I have two questions. I guess I could ask them both at the same time. One has to do with this issue about the radiological impacts. And doing that evaluation, did the NRC actually look at public health data in terms of the level of disease in the communities that you know are in the effluent pathway of the reactor?

MODERATOR CAMERON: Did you have a second question too?

MR. JUDSON: The second question has to do with high level waste storage and whether the study actually looked at the incremental effect of generating I think it is up to 250 tons more high

level radioactive waste spent fuel that would need to be stored in the community?

MR. NEITZEL: Okay, Rich, are you going to address the questions?

MODERATOR CAMERON: This is the first question that Tim raised relates to what I think are commonly referred to as epidemiology studies to see what types of health effects there are in a community, and Mr. Rich Emch is a health physicist with the NRC who perhaps can shed some light on that generally. And if we know anything specifically about what's been done in New York or this region that would be helpful.

Rich? All right. And then Tim may have a follow up on that after you get done.

MR. EMCH: As I understand it, well, actually, the most direct answer that there was no new examination of health studies in the area around Ginna as part of this review process. However, and as far as I know, that's true both for the state and for us. We didn't do any new studies. However, we do rely on there's some studies that's been done in the past and mainly though it is an issue of we did look at what kinds of effluence, what kinds of doses there might be from the -- am I still not close enough?

We did look at what kinds of effluence are

being released from the plant and what kinds of doses could be estimated from those releases, and those are very small. And from that, the inference is no, we did not need to go do or did not need to go examine additional health studies and sort of thing. The doses at which damage has been found, if you will, impacts have been found, they're in the range of say, 10,000 millirem. I'm using that particular thing because I'm going to kind of walk our way down through here.

Studies like the Bier report, international studies have shown that there are impacts, health impacts, above say 10,000 millirem.

In fact, there's been many studies, literally thousands of studies of the impact of radiation on human health, and none of those studies have shown impacts at the lower doses, the kinds of doses we're going to be talking about here. As a member of the human race living on this planet, we all receive somewhere in the neighborhood of 300 millirem a year from various -- a naturally occurring radionuclides and things like that. So you know we're starting off with 10,000 is the place where impacts have been seen. Now we're done to what we all receive every year, which is the 300.

The NRC's regulations for effluence from nuclear power plants allow doses in the range from 5 to 10 millirem per year from operational plant. And in fact, after looking at the effluent data for this plant, the doses from gaseous and liquid effluence from this plant to the maximally exposed individual are well below one. They're in the range of a 10th of a millirem or less. So at those doses, there was no reason to believe that anything additional need to be looked at as far as health consequences. Does that answer your question?

MR. JUDSON: Well, it does. I mean, my question was just whether you actually looked at the data on the levels of disease in the community, and it sounds like you didn't.

MR. EMCH: That's correct.

MODERATOR CAMERON: And the NRC, if there were studies that showed that there were increases in cancer or something like that in the community, that would be the type of information that you wouldn't want to know about.

MR. EMCH: We were not made aware of anything like that. If there is such information, we, of course, would be very interested in seeing it, yes.

MODERATOR CAMERON: And we did check with

the state, New York State Department who usually deals with that.

MR. EMCH: Yes, that's correct.

MODERATOR CAMERON: All right. Tim, before we go to the high level waste question, do you want to add anything on this? Okay.

Spent fuel storage, John Tappert?

MR. TAPPERT: The question I had was the additional waste only generated during the renewal period evaluated? And when Duane was going through the original structure of how we do these reviews, he talked about the generic environmental impact statement that looked at generic issues and then site specific issues. The waste that will be associated with an additional 20 years of operation is a generic issue. That will be similar impacts at all the operating power plants.

So in fact, it was evaluated, but it was evaluated in that generic environmental impact statement. And during our review, we did not identify any additional new and significant information that would challenge those earlier assessments.

Additionally, the Commission has made a judgment as codified in the regulations that waste can be safely stored at reactor sites for up to 30 years

beyond the expiration of the operating license. And that includes the renewal term. Those are the two elements that I think address your question.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Anything to add onto that one, Tim?

MR. JUDSON: It's curious that you say that that's a generic issue. Since the Department of Energy, in doing its own environmental impact statement about you know, sort of actually moving a lot of the waste out to Yucca Mountain found that if you assume that Ginna is going to be relicensed that in 40 years when Yucca is full and can't accept any more waste that there's still going to be 102 metric tons of high level waste sitting at that site. And you know, if you didn't do the license extension, that wouldn't be true.

Canada does not support Yucca Mountain. There's a lot of problems with that dump site, but given that the NRC seems to you know, take Yucca Mountain going forward into account of a lot of other things it does, it seems like a really relevant issue in terms of site-specific impact that if this license extension goes forward, there's probably going to be probably at least 100 tons of waste sitting here for an indeterminate period of time.

MR. TAPPERT: Well, when we say it's generic, it doesn't mean that's necessarily no impact. It's just that the impacts associated with the extension at Ginna would be somewhere similar to the extension at any other nuclear power plant. And the impacts associated with that were consistent and found to be acceptable. Now the point that you're making that Yucca Mountain that it is not licensed, which it is not, but that's a national level decision and the Department of Energy and the Congress and the NRC are dealing with that.

But the Commission has determined that the waste is not in jeopardy right now. It can be safely stored on site and that there will be a geological repository, be it Yucca Mountain or some other place within the first quarter of the century. So that's where we are today.

MODERATOR CAMERON: And I know that Tim knows about this process that's going on now. But perhaps other people might be interested in the fact that the NRC is revisiting the generic environmental impact statement on license renewal. And I take it that Tim's point is that if there's extra spent fuel generated because of license renewal, which just exacerbates the high level waste problem. Now that's

the type of issue that this issue would probably be that you would refer over, also refer over to the people doing the regional, the revisit.

Is that correct, John?

MR. TAPPERT: Yes, Chip, and that's a good point which I should have raised earlier. The transportation and the fuel cycle issues are addressed in the generic environmental impact statement. Now as a policy matter, we're updating that on a 10-year basis. Now that 10 years is coming up, it expires in 2006. So right now we're actually seeking public comment through September on issues that should be addressed in that generic, environmental impact statement. And there's a license renewal, there's a website to receive comments on that, and there's other addresses I can give you as well. So if you're interested in taking on this category one or generic issues, that will be the forum to do it.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Other questions on the preliminary conclusions in the draft environmental impact statement at this point? And again, we can go back after the formal comment and see if anybody has any other questions at that point. Why don't we go on to Mark Rubin, and thank you very much Duane. And Mark is going to talk about severe

accident mitigation alternatives, and then we'll go back out for questions and I think Bob Schaaf after that will tell people how to submit comments and then we'll go out to you for formal comments. Mark?

MR. RUBIN: Thank you, Chip. As Chip mentioned earlier, I am Section Chief in the Probabilistic Safety Assessment Branch, which is nuclear reactor regulation. The Commission has -- am I tuned in here? I'm a little short for this. As the Commission has determined that the environmental assessment for Ginna for all the license renewal plants, will include a plant specific assessment, severe accident mitigation alternatives, even though severe accident risks for all reactors have been shown to be quite small.

Now what's a severe accident? When the plants are -- and this is very different from the designed based accidents that the plants were originally licensed for. When the plants were originally licensed, they were assessed against designed basis accidents. They're prescribed sets of accidents -- they're very complete, very specific, involving such things as pipe breaks, normally called loss-of-coolant accidents, equipment failure, most conservative assumptions in the analysis. And the

plants were shown to be very robust, have a lot of capabilities for surviving these accidents and meeting very prescriptive accident evaluation criteria.

Both the safety and the environmental impacts were shown to be very small during the original plant licensing. Since that time, additional techniques have been developed called the probabalistic risk assessment, severe accident assessment, that give us the ability to look at events that are more complex events that are of a very low probability. Very low frequency. These go beyond the types of accidents that were evaluated during the original plant licensing and the new tools we have available allow us to mathematically predict the likelihood, the probabilities and the consequences of accidents of this kind.

These severe accidents, as they're called, are hypothetical accidents of very low probability, that can result in rather large damage to the reactor core and some potential hypothetical off-site consequences to the public.

So how do we do these studies? Techniques called probabilistic risk assessment are used to model these hypothetical accidents using mathematical modeling, computer modeling, to look at very complex,

very long sequences of equipment failure, what we call accident initiators, that progress through a lot of failures to give severe damage to the reactor core.

And studies like these are used to evaluate the severe accident mitigation alternatives, which are ways to reduce the likelihood of the consequences of these beyond design basis severe accidents. If you go on to the next view graph, thank you.

(Slide change.)

MR. RUBIN: So how's all this done? How's this SAMA analysis conducted? Conceptually, it is rather simple, though the tools and techniques used are relativity complex. The first step of the process is to characterize the overall plant risk. What are the likelihood, what are the consequences of these severe accidents? And for that, as I've mentioned before, we used the technique called PRA, probabilistic risk assessment, which is essentially a model, an analytical, mathematical model of the plant, all of the important components, structures, with failure likelihoods, models, mathematical models of the success of these systems and how they have to respond to keep a severe accident from occurring.

And these studies will typically give you

frequencies of various types of severe accidents and also likelihoods of such things as containment failure and off-site consequences, as you carry them out to the extreme of those types of studies that can be done with our current analytical tools. That would be the first step in a SAMA analysis process, which is a good complete, plant specific, probabilistic risk assessment.

The next step in the SAMA analysis is to identify potential plant improvements based on the insights that you get from the PRA. And typically, the assessment that was done by Rochester Gas and Electric would look at such things as hardware modifications, procedure changes, training program improvements, a full spectrum of potential improvements to the plant and its operating process and procedures.

Typically, what we're looking for in our assessment of the SAMA process are changes, modifications, improvements, that would reduce the likelihood of core damage in a severe accident, or improve the response of the containment following a severe accident, so there would be no releases to the environment.

After you've identified the primary set of

potential improvements, then the real key in doing a SAMA analysis is to quantify the risk reduction potential and implementation cost.

Again, that's done using a multitude of analytical tools that attempt to predict and to model how these improvements will reduce the severe accident risk. Namely, it will look at the probabilities of these severe accidents, and there's a whole sequence of the scenarios that are involved. And these improvements will result in some, hopefully, potentially, result in some reduction in the probability of the severe accidents or their consequences or containment response.

At the same time, you look at the implementation cost of actually making the changes so that you can get a sense of what we call cost benefit assessment. Namely, are the benefits through the reduction in the severe accident likelihood or consequences more beneficial than the implementation costs of doing the improvement? After looking at the cost benefit results, both the benefits and the costs, at the end, we'll look at whether the potential improvements, if any of them are shown to be cost beneficial, are actually related to a license renewal type of issue. Namely, something that's an aging

related degradation type of issue.

Go onto the new view graph

(Slide change.)

MR. RUBIN: The evaluation and SAMA analysis initially looked at about 200 candidate improvements, and through a set of very screening evaluations, winnowed them down to a much more manageable level, ultimately eight ones that were given a detailed analysis.

Typically, when you do these types of evaluations, you start out doing a fairly conservative analysis. You look at what risk you can, residual risk that the plant has from the severe accident evaluations that are done. And you make very simplistic assumptions. If you can make all the risk in a certain area go away, then that's the maximum benefit you could get from a category of improvement.

So you make some rather simplifying assumptions when you start out to find out which candidates would potentially give you a reasonable amount of benefit. And as these went down a more complete evaluation process, there were a set of eight that were given a more detailed, both engineering and cost benefit evaluation to get a more complete analytical result, what the benefits were and what the

costs were.

When this was completed, two of the eight improvements that were subjected to the detailed study were found to be cost beneficial. Namely, the reduction in risk that you achieved from implementing those improvements were more than the cost of doing them. And what do we mean when we say the benefit? To calculate the benefit, the PRA model is used with some off-site dose-consequence models to look at the potential severe accident impact on both the external environment, as well as the plant itself.

So it is a fairly complete assessment of the total cost, averted cost is what we call it, of the severe accident being reduced in probability or consequences. Both the off-site health impact, off-site economic impact, and on-site impacts. And those are all compared with the cost of doing the improvement to see if it is cost beneficial. The two that were found to be cost beneficial following this evaluation was addition of a third diesel generator, which would be of assistance during what we call station blackout severe accidents. And that's the type of accident that postulates that all the multiple safety systems providing on-site AC emergency power were to fail and that this additional source of power

would provide AC power to keep maintaining core heat removal.

It was a fairly expensive improvement, about $400,000 was the initial estimate. But it gave a reasonable risk reduction, and so in this case was found to be cost beneficial. Additionally, the cross connection revision to the procedures of repairing the charging pumps was also found to be cost beneficial. This would cross connect the B and C charging pumps to train A power source to essentially provide additional protection during severe accident fire scenario accidents.

Go on to the next view graph.

(Slide change.)

MR. RUBIN: Well, basically these two SAMAs were found to be cost beneficial using typical traditional cost benefit analysis. The risk for the plant, in general, was quite low and the benefits from these two improvements were reasonable. They weren't exceedingly large, but because of the costs and the benefits, they were shown to be cost beneficial. However, neither of these are an aging related degradation issue. And so they're not specifically related to the license renewal process itself.

Consequently, these improvements would not

be required as part of the license renewal process, but rather will be entered into the plant's prioritization scheme for planned upgrades, design enhancements, and, in fact, the staff will also follow up on this issue as part of putting it into our safety process to continue to follow the licensee's plans in this area.

That completes the SAMA evaluation and I'd be glad to answer any questions I could.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Thanks a lot, Mark. It was a good example, I think, of how things that are identified during license renewal but perhaps not implemented because it doesn't tie in or implement it through other NRC activities. But are there any questions on this? Yes, sir. And please tell us who you are.

MR. SANTIROCCO: I'm Raymond Santirocco, and for the reporter that's S-A-N-T-I-R-O-C-C-O. I am a member of the Monroe County Legislature. I'm the Chairman of the Public Safety Committee, and the issue of radiological safety comes under the purview of our committee. That's something I'm very interested in. In a prior life, I had also been public safety commissioner of the county back at the time we first started planning for accidents when NUREG 0654 was

first issued.

So I've been following the history of this with some interest. And I have a question with respect to the cost benefit analysis of the SAMA process. And there's something that's troubled me about cost benefit analysis, in general, and maybe you have some thoughts on it. The cost associated with these improvements are generally costs that are going to be incurred by the operator. The example that you gave of these two, the costs incurred by the operator, yet the benefits or the avoided cost as you pointed out can occur, you know, anywhere. It can save some farmer 15 miles downwind some money.

Therefore, it has always seemed to me that you're comparing incomparable things, and you're comparing benefits that may accrue to certain people to costs that are incurred by other people. And can you equate those?

MR. RUBIN: It's a profound question, of course. I think we can compare them. We're looking at impacts on society as a whole. We're looking at the costs of implementing reductions in public impact, public risk. By the nature of the process, the cost to reduce public risk will come upon the utility if they're the operator of the plant.

The methodology used is a relatively straightforward one that's pretty consistently used, certainly within the nuclear industry.

I believe it is also used throughout the government, in general, to try and get a handle on the relative benefits versus the relative costs. And in doing that, your choice of 50 miles was an interesting one, because indeed that's the distance that they met with the models, will typically produce the off-site consequences to generate the cost benefit numbers.

The calculation will look at both the salient impacts, but also the plant impacts. And in that typically there can be some very large impacts, the replacement cost for example, the real actual cost to the workers, is as complete a model as a decision maker from our perspective can make it.

If we were to leave out the, for example, the cost to the utility, that would tend to make the changes less beneficial and less attractive. So what we do is we try to include as many of the costs as possible in the analysis, because it tends to make things more attractive to implement, to correct, to fix, to reduce the risk from.

To look at the impact, that's the other side of the equation, the models we use and the

analytical methods are as complete as we can make them, looking at both the impact of the land contamination, the public health impacts, which are from the external side the most significant ones. But as I've said, we don't stop there, we also look at the on-site costs to make sure we have a more level playing field.

So there's not an absolutely correct answer to your question. But what we try to do is make the analysis process as complete as we can reasonably can make it so that we have a really well founded, analytical decision making framework to try to make appropriate decisions from. And if -- that's a good answer?

MODERATOR CAMERON: Let's get some input from Rich Emch and then we'll come back to Mr. Santirocco to see if he has anything else that wants to say.

Rich, do you have something to add on that?

MR. EMCH: In a way, your comment is along the lines of why does the guy who is living at 50 miles care how much it costs this utility to put this thing in here that's going to help save his life? Right? Okay.

I'm not sure if the 50 miles example is perfect, but let's remember that this power plant is producing electricity for the people in this region. I don't know about the guy 50 miles, but a lot of the people within 50 miles, and the costs ultimately of whatever they do here to operate this plant and to make changes to the plant, to make it safer, those costs get carried over to a least some degree in what that farmer whoever pays in terms of his electric bill.

So that makes it a little bit more of a you know, a cost and the benefit impact on that individual to some degree. I just thought I'd mention that.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Rich.

Mr. Santirocco, do you want to add anything?

MR. SANTIROCCO: Well, I thank both gentlemen for very complete responses, and I think I'm convinced, well convinced, that the process of analysis identifies all of the factors to the extent that it is humanly possible to do so.

How you add them up and how you do the arithmetic when you get them all identified I guess we can occasionally disagree a little bit.

MR. RUBIN: I can just reference you to the source document to the way the analysis is done, if that would be of any help to you. It is NUREG BR0184.

MODERATOR CAMERON: And what is the title of that?

MR. RUBIN: Unfortunately, I didn't jot it down.

MODERATOR CAMERON: All right. Well, if anybody needs, wants a copy or whatever we can obviously get that for you.

So are there other questions about the severe accident mitigation alternatives at this point?

All right, thank you very much, Mark.

And Bob is just going to give us a run down on how to submit comments and then we're going to go out to you for more formal comment.

MR. SCHAAF: Right, and we're running a little long so I'll try to move smartly through this so we can get to your comments. Turning to our overall preliminary conclusions, we found that the impacts of license renewal are small in all impact areas.

We also concluded that the alternative actions including the no action alternative may have

environmental effects in at least some impact categories that reach moderate or large significance.

Based on these results, our preliminary recommendation is that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for Ginna are not so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decision makers would be unreasonable. It's a wordy phrase. It's the way our regulation is written on license renewal.

(Slide change.)

MR. SCHAAF: This slide provides a quick recap of the current status of the review. We issued the draft environmental impact statement on June 25. We're currently in the middle of the public comment period, scheduled to close on September 16th, and our goal is to address public comments including any necessary changes to the draft and issue the final statement in February of next year.

We can mail a copy to anyone who is interested in receiving a copy, if you fill out one of the blue or yellow cards at our registration desk. After the document is issued, it will be reviewed by the EPA. They'll have 30 days in which to make a determination as to the acceptability of the final impact statement. After that point, it will be

available as providing part of the basis for the NRC's decision on the proposed license renewal.

The final statement along with the safety evaluation report, inspection reports, and ACRS report which Russ described earlier will be considered by the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation in making a final decision regarding whether to issue a new renewed license to Ginna.

The NRC staff and our lab personnel are here today to answer your questions. Feel free to talk to us after the meeting. If you have any questions after today, you can contact me directly at the phone number provided on the slide.

This slide also provides options for accessing the draft impact statement for your review and comment. We do have some copies available today at the back of the room. The Ontario and Rochester public libraries have copies available for review and the document is also available on the internet at the address shown on the slide.

Next slide, please.

(Slide change.)

MR. SCHAAF: This meeting is being transcribed, and the comments provided here will be considered in finalizing the draft environmental

impact statement. Outside of this meeting, there are, I believe, four ways to provide comments. We have the three options identified on the slide, which are you can mail us comments at the address shown. If you happen to be in Rockville, Maryland, feel free to stop into our office and provide written comments. Or they can be provided by e-mail to the address given here.

You may also provide comments through an on-line comment form which is available when you access the web copy of the Draft Impact Statement discussed on the previous slide.

All comments provided through all methods will be considered in preparing the final impact statement. That concludes my wrap up.

I'd like to thank the Ontario fire department for allowing us to use their hall today. I'd also like to thank you all for taking time to attend for your questions and I look forward to hearing your comments.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Bob. If there are any questions about process after we get done with the comments, I think we'll have time to field them. But let's move on to the comments.

Do you have something else to say? Go ahead, Bob.

MR. SCHAAF: I also just wanted to point out anyone who hadn't caught it is we do have pitchers of water available over in the corner. I encourage you to avail yourselves of a cool drink.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Okay, thanks Bob. Let's go to Mr. Michael Havens first from the Central School District, in Wayne County, right?

MR. HAVENS: Wayne Central.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Wayne Central. Okay, thank you.

MR. HAVENS: Good afternoon. First I'd like to thank the NRC for coming out here to Ontario. You seemed to have chased the rain away and we appreciate that after about a week of unrelenting rain, and also for the opportunity for all of us to speak here about the relicensing of the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant.

As has been said, my name is Michael Havens. I'm the superintendent of the Wayne Central School District, located primarily here in the town of Ontario and also the town of Walmouth, although we are in parts of the town of Webster, parts of town of Merriam, Williamson, and Penfield.

The Ginna nuclear power plant is located within our school district. As a matter of fact, it

is approximately six miles from our high school, our middle school, and two of our three elementary schools. I say that and say that I'm here to support the relicensing of the Ginna nuclear power plant. And I say that primarily for three reasons.

First of all, the Ginna plant has been an excellent corporate neighbor. It also provides a great tax base for the school district, and lastly, it provides a good standard of living for the parents of our children that are here. And let me talk a little about the economic tax base, first of all. Over the last five years, the Ginna nuclear power plant has provided us with more than $15 million worth of revenue.

And in fact, just this last year they provided more than $3.1 million of tax revenue for our children. Now that represented about 21.9 percent of the tax revenue generated for our school district. That means that about one in every five dollars is spent from tax revenue for our children comes from that one plant.

Conversely, the loss of that would be disastrous both for our school children and also for the tax payers would have to make up the difference.

Secondly, in terms of being a good

corporate neighbor, while I must admit it is scary for all of us to think about an accident at the plant, and especially for me, who is responsible for about 2,900 children, I also realize that the Ginna nuclear power plant is recognized nationally, is one of the best run plants.

Also, we are confident in plant manager Joe Widay and people like Rick Watts and the others who operate the plant. And in fact, particularly post-9/11, we feel very comfortable it's a secure site with the addition of the National Guardspeople.

We also run annual evacuation drills and feel we are prepared for an emergency should it happen.

Lastly is the standard of living that it provides my children. The Ginna nuclear power plant itself provides about 500 jobs. Additionally, there's about 300 related jobs through private companies. That provides a standard of living to the people who work there, most of which the people who live here in our community and provides decent houses, it provides middle class values and opportunities for our children.

In fact, I have to say that those of us that live here in Ontario would say that we kind of

have the best of both worlds. We live in a very rural atmosphere, yet we have the economic base of a more suburban area. So from my perspective, Ginna has been a good corporate neighbor. It provides a great economic tax base and it also provides a good standard of living for our children, and I wholeheartedly look forward to continue support of Ginna and hope that there's success with the relicensing. Thank you.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr. Havens. We're going to go to Mr. Robert Mecredy next, who is the Vice President of Nuclear Operations for Rochester Gas and Electric to tell us a little bit about their vision and rationale for the license renewal application, and then we're going to go to Mr. Tim Judson from Citizen's Awareness Network.

Mr. Mecredy.

MR. MECREDY: Thanks, Chip. I am Bob Mecredy, Vice President of Nuclear Operations for RG&E and have responsibility for the operation of Ginna. I appreciate the opportunity to comment. RG&E submitted its application, our application, for a license renewal just about a year ago. We're seeking the license renewal in order to preserve the option to operate Ginna in the renewed period. And this recognizes the fact that Ginna and the electricity it

produces can be a valuable asset to the community and, in fact, to the state.

Because Ginna produces about half the electricity on an annual basis is that it is used in the RG&E service territory. So it's not an insignificant contribution to the local area.

The NRC is seeking comments here as part of the review, and this is but one step and once the safety review has been commented on will be forthcoming and we look forward to reviewing the NRC's safety review when it is issued here in the next several months.

RG&E and the employees of Ginna take seriously and always have our responsibility to operate safely and to minimize the impact of the plant and our operations on the environment. An early, relatively small, but yet very visible example of that intention that's paid to the environment is the attention paid to the aesthetics of the plant and the design provides that the plant blends into the environment. And we continue that attention not just to the aesthetics, but also to the overall environmental well being.

We continue to monitor our safety and the environmental performance. We learn from others. We

search for way to improve our performance. There also is ongoing independent oversight by the NRC and by others.

In our application, we did conduct an environmental review using our own experts and specialists and outside experts. And our conclusion was that operation in the extended period would be acceptable from an environmental standpoint.

As you've heard, the NRC's preliminary conclusion is that there's no reason from an environmental impact statement here not to renew the license. And we concur with that preliminary conclusion. It should be noted and it's important to note that as we continue to operate, we will continue to set as a priority safe and environmentally responsible operation. We'll continually monitor and measure our performance against standards, and we'll search out ways to improve our performance. Thank you.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Bob.

Next we're going to hear from Tim Judson from Citizens Awareness Network.

MR. JUDSON: Thanks, Chip. We appreciate the opportunity to give comments. My name is Tim Judson. I'm with the Central New York chapter of the

Citizens Awareness Network. I actually live in Syracuse, New York. But I'm here today because of the sort of the regional concern about the impact of this relicensing decision. And it is actually going to be the first in a series of relicensing decisions that goes on in our area. The next ones to come up actually they're going to apply to relicense both the Nine-Mile Point reactors come October.

And you know, when I was here at the meeting in November, the first of these meetings about this environmental review. You know, seeing that there were a lot of sort of dead elephants sitting around the room that no one was really talking about. It is interesting that those dead elephants are still there and they're still not being talked about. As the NRC is sort of slicing and dicing its way through this decision, one of the things that have come that seems fundamental and we actually looked into this that there's actually in terms of the end of the regions energy needs, there's no need for Ginna for electricity.

In fact, there's an article that was published in the Syracuse Post Standard two years ago that laid out that Central and Western New York actually generate about 50 percent more power than we

ever need, even on the hottest day. And Ginna represents less than 10 percent of that surplus, and it is less than 3 percent of the total energy generation in the region. And it is really remarkable in looking at this whole issue of whether it makes sense to preserve this option, the NRC didn't even seem to take that into account that there's this massive surplus of energy in our area.

And what that means in a lot of ways is this whole question about trading benefits to the community versus risks is really sort of irrelevant in a lot of ways, because if you look at what's going to happen if Ginna is relicensed, and it is going to be sold. That's another one of the dead elephants in the room. Ginna is not going to owned by RG&E much longer if this license extension is granted.

The rate payers are going to end up paying about 3 billion dollars for electricity from this reactor over 20 years. You know, we can't actually improve our safety and our environment by shutting down this reactor and spending $3 billion on other things. We can't conserve 3 percent of our energy in this region for the cost of $3 billion in electricity? We can't afford to pay for a thorough and good clean up of the site from all the radioactive waste that's

there? And we can't make up for the loss of property taxes to the school district with $3 billion?

This really seems like the kind of questions that needs to be addressed. And maybe it is not the NRC that can do that. Maybe this is something that the community needs to do and that the region needs to do and actually needs to happen through the state. But these are fundamental issues to this whole question of whether to relicense. And when you weigh that against the risk of having this reactor operating in the community and generating more high level waste, it is sort of bizarre that the NRC treats safety and the creation of nuclear waste as having the same environmental impact as not doing it, which is essentially what comes out in the SEIS if you read it is that when evaluating the option of not relicensing and the reactor shutting down in 5 years, that the NRC says by the way there's a low environmental impact in that because it means it would all stop.

And then in looking at the risk of going forward in terms of having accidents, in terms of generating you know another 200 tons of high level radioactive waste that will be stored in the community, that's a low impact too. And so, of course, the NRC is going to go along with the

relicensing because, of course, you know they can't distinguish between operating a reactor and shutting it down.

So there's a lot of ways in which the supplemental environmental impact statement seems like it really misses the point.

And it is geared more to passing the buck on to the Public Service Commission, which is perhaps what needs to happen. But what is really essential at this point is that there be an evaluation of this and maybe it is the community that needs to do it. But we're all on this boat together and we all have to take it on.

MODERATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Tim.

Is there anybody else that wants to speak? Any other questions on issues that we didn't cover or anything that the NRC wants to add at this point for public information?

Okay, thank you all for coming out and being with us today. I'm going to ask John Tappert to close the meeting out for us real quickly.

John?

MR. TAPPERT: And I, too, would add my voice to thank you for coming out today and sharing your thoughts with us.

We have a number of staff and contractors with us here today, so if you'd like to ask anyone a question on a one to one basis we'll be staying after the meeting. Thanks again.

(Whereupon, at 3:15 p.m., the meeting was the record.)